



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRD ANNUAL MEETING, CHICAGO, NOVEMBER 27 TO 29, 1913

The third annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English was held at the Auditorium Hotel in Chicago on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of Thanksgiving week. The general arrangements were the same as last year. There was, however, a new section, that of Librarians, while the Normal- and Elementary-School sections and the College and High-School sections held joint sessions. The attendance was about 25 per cent larger than last year. All parts of the country except New England were represented.

BUSINESS

The policy of rotation in office announced last year was maintained. The Nominating Committee, which consisted of E. H. K. McComb, Elizabeth Barbour, Elmer W. Smith, Edwin M. Hopkins, and Ernest C. Noyes, presented the names of eleven persons to serve as directors for a period of three years and the report was adopted. The new directors are as follows: Nathaniel W. Barnes, DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind.; Emma J. Breck, Oakland High School, Oakland, Cal.; C. C. Certain, Central High School, Birmingham, Ala.; John M. Clapp, Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Ill.; Charles W. Kent, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.; William D. Lewis, Penn High School, Philadelphia, Pa.; Sarah J. McNary, State Normal School, Trenton, N.J.; A. E. Minard, Agricultural College, N.D.; Fred N. Scott, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; O. B. Sperlin, Tacoma High School, Tacoma, Wash.; Sarah E. Simons, Central High School, Washington, D.C.

The outgoing directors are those who were chosen for the two-year term when the Council was organized. They are the following: Directors Bassett, McComb, Pittenger, Barbour, Squires, Peake, Dorey, and Powers. Director Scott, being the retiring president of the Council, was re-elected, and two additional persons were elected to the Board so as to bring it up to the full number provided by the constitution.

The new Board of Directors met after the annual dinner and elected the officers of the Council in accordance with the constitution. These are as follows: President, Franklin T. Baker, professor of English, Teachers College, Columbia University; First Vice-President, Charles W. Kent, professor of English, University of Virginia; Second Vice-President, Vincil C. Coulter, professor of English, State Normal School, Warrensburg, Mo.; Secretary, James F. Hosis, professor of English, Chicago Normal College; Treasurer, John M. Clapp, professor of English, Lake Forest College; member of the Executive Committee for a term of three years, Fred N. Scott, University of Michigan.

At the closing session of the Council the following resolution was offered by J. W. Searson of the Kansas Agricultural College and adopted:

Resolved, That the members of the National Council of Teachers of English extend to Professor Scott, retiring president, and to the other officers, a vote of thanks for their unselfish devotion to the interests of the Association and their untiring and effective efforts to secure a good program for the annual meeting and to promote in every possible way the work which the Council is seeking to do.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

At various sessions of the Council eleven committees presented reports. The committee on pedagogical investigation reported by its chairman, Professor Barnes, that it favored the appointment of a new committee on this subject, to continue from year to year and to perform the following services: (1) to publish yearly in the *English Journal* an annotated bibliography of investigations bearing upon the teaching of English; (2) to recommend to the Executive Committee of the Council problems for investigation; (3) to attempt to standardize methods of investigation; (4) to record the results of previous investigations, changes in teaching, practice, etc. It was voted to approve these recommendations and reorganize the committee in accordance with them.

The Committee on the Articulation of the Elementary Course in English with the Course in English in the High School made a final report, which was adopted. A summary of this report follows. The full text will appear in a monograph of the Bureau of Education at Washington in company with a report on Types of Organization of High-School English.

SUMMARY OF THE FINAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ARTICULATION
OF THE ELEMENTARY-SCHOOL COURSE IN ENGLISH WITH THE
HIGH-SCHOOL COURSE IN ENGLISH

The Committee on the Articulation of the Elementary and High-School Courses in English was appointed to report conditions as they actually exist and to offer suggestions for improvement. The crux of the whole investigation carried on by this committee has been the difficulty of securing definite data. The chief trouble has been that in many cases the answers to the questions asked by the committee and the courses of study accompanying these answers have been phrased in such vague and general terms as to need much interpretation. The lack of a clearly defined terminology of English studies is evidently one of the greatest obstacles to satisfactory articulation. The conclusions in this report, therefore, are put forth as tentative in regard to details and only as generalizations.

The committee finds in the elementary school, as conditions hindering good articulation: requirements too extensive and too indefinite; subjects like dry, unapplied grammar, the analysis of specimens of discourse, and formal rhetoric, ill adapted to young pupils, together with too little practice in speaking and writing; in some schools reading not extensive enough, and too little drill on the essentials of spelling, punctuation, manuscript neatness, and the ready conventional use of paper. In the high-school courses the requirements are too ambitious, lack elasticity, and are often unrelated to the interests of the entering classes, to which there is little continuous effort to adapt the work. May not this tendency of the high schools to use in the first year books poorly adapted to the interests and tastes of the pupils be due to the influence of the College Entrance Requirements?

In a large majority of the schools, articulation seems to be unsatisfactory generally. It is especially defective in reading and literature and in composition, oral and written. The chief causes of poor articulation named in the replies received by the committee are defects in the curriculum and methods of the elementary school and differences in the organization and methods of teaching of the two types of schools. To the committee, however, it seems that these are not the true causes. Poor articulation is due more than to any other cause to failure to make any systematic effort to secure good adjustment between the courses of the two schools.

Good articulation is chiefly and primarily a matter of organization. It arises from a good selection of material by well-educated, professionally minded, enthusiastic, conscientious teachers of elementary and high schools *working together for a common end under amalgamating supervision.*

As remedies, which, it must be distinctly understood, are only palliatives without the establishment of the healthful general condition named above as essential to permanently successful articulation, the committee recommends:

1. That the large and complex terminology of English be clearly defined

by those whose position enables them to speak with authority so that the work to be done in any particular part of the school course can be accurately stated and clearly understood.

2. That the ground to be covered in each phase of English in each type of school be carefully delimited.

3. That in each school the course of study be simplified and revised so as to include very much less formal grammar but much more thorough drill in applied grammar; so as to include a wider range of reading-matter and much more oral composition; and so as to appeal more to the sympathies and interests of pupils. That in the high-school course separation be made between what may be called "practical English," which every pupil should study, and so-called "cultural English."

4. That full, definite syllabi, rich in specific details, be prepared and printed for the guidance of teachers.

5. That the organization of the two schools be planned and the courses administered in such a way as to contribute to good articulation by the employment of such and as many of the schemes following as may be feasible in any particular locality:

- A. The assignment of the most efficient teachers in the high school to charge of first-year classes.
- B. The use of the system of departmental teaching in the elementary school, or of the elementary-school organization under one teacher in several subjects in the first year of the high school, or both.
- C. The promotion of acquaintance and mutual co-operation between teachers in the two classes of schools by means of joint conferences, exchange of visits, notification by the high-school teachers of the prevailing faults in English of entering pupils, and similar methods.
- D. The promotion of successful elementary-school teachers to the work of the first year of the high school for a year at least.
- E. The complete reorganization of the two schools on the plan giving six years to each.
- F. The close correlation and continuous supervision of the two courses by a supervisor of English, or other competent authority.

ERNEST C. NOYES, *Chairman*, Peabody High School, Pittsburgh, Pa.

SARAH J. McNARY, State Normal School, Trenton, N.J.

THEODORE C. MITCHILL, Jamaica High School, Jamaica, N.Y.

J. W. SEARSON, State Agricultural College, Manhattan, Kan.

JAMES B. SMILEY, Lincoln High School, Cleveland, Ohio

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE REVISION OF GRAMMATICAL TERMINOLOGY

In the preliminary report of this committee, presented to the Council one year ago, our task was defined as that of agreeing upon "the best grammatical terminology which seems to be attainable in the conditions." The

"best" terminology, the committee held to be that which is (1) necessary, in order to indicate real distinctions of form and structure in English speech, (2) accurate in its indication of these distinctions, and (3) economical, in a far-sighted sense of the word, that is, calculated, under existing conditions, to impress these distinctions upon pupils' minds with the minimum of friction and waste.

Upon this understanding of the requirements, two members of the committee prepared and submitted for criticism to every other member a list of terms adapted from the list proposed by the New York City Teachers' Association. In the midst of this process, however, it became evident that we were duplicating the work which was going on at the same time in the Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature, appointed by the National Education Association, the Modern Language Association, and the American Philological Association. Though this duplication of effort was manifestly uneconomical, we were at first inclined to justify it on the ground that the experience and judgment of the English teacher, which must be of primary importance in such an inquiry, could, in the nature of the case, be represented only by a small minority (actually two members) of the Joint Committee. The Joint Committee, however, did much to destroy the force of this argument by a generous co-operation with our committee. One member of our committee, Mr. C. R. Rounds, was also a member of the Joint Committee. Mr. C. R. Gaston, of our committee, attended by invitation a meeting of the Joint Committee in Chicago last November. The partial and tentative reports of the Joint Committee have been from time to time sent to all members of our committee for criticism and suggestion. These criticisms and suggestions, together with the list of terms proposed by our committee, were presented to the consideration of the Joint Committee by its chairman, Professor Hale. Professor Hale also conferred regarding the Joint Committee's report with three members of our committee at their homes.

In the light of these facts, it has seemed desirable to further the movement for uniformity by adoption of the Joint Committee's report. No two committees, as hardly two individuals, would, without co-operation and mutual concession, present identical recommendations; and conflicting recommendations must increase rather than diminish the confusion of the present order. Without a more fundamental divergence of opinion, therefore, than actually exists between the two committees, we could not find ourselves justified in presenting a separate list of terms for your consideration.

Accordingly we recommend for adoption the report of the Joint Committee which was presented to the National Education Association at its meeting in July of the present year. This report is accessible to every member of the Council and doubtless has been read by every member interested in the question. Those who have read it must, I think, agree with our committee that it represents the carefully sifted opinion of these fifteen experts in linguistic study and teaching, who have not only considered individually, but have dis-

cussed fully with one another in the sessions of the committee, every point in the proposed terminology. The tests of necessity, accuracy, and economy seem to us to be sustained on the whole by the list of terms chosen—sustained, in fact, so far as may be reasonably expected from any list upon which at the present time variant opinions could unite. This is the utmost to be said in favor of any report which might be presented upon this subject, and it must, in fairness, we believe, be said of the report before you. As we have frequently been reminded, no terminology can possibly represent *in toto* the grammatical creed of each individual, even on a single committee; but everyone concerned understands that if we are now to take a step forward in this matter of a rational uniformity in grammatical nomenclature, individual prejudices and preferences must yield to our stronger desires for the common good. That this report is a step forward, and that at least three great educational organizations in America are ready to take it at the present time, seems good reason for our falling in, whether we regard it as the end of our progress or only the beginning. This committee regards it as a beginning, but as a beginning apparently indispensable to any further undertakings; and it is in such a light that it recommends for adoption to you the report of the Joint Committee.

GERTRUDE BUCK, *Chairman*, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y.

GENEVIEVE APGAR, Harris Teachers' College, St. Louis, Mo.

JOHN H. COX, University of West Virginia, Morgantown, W.Va.

CHARLES ROBERT GASTON, Richmond Hill High School, Richmond Hill, N.Y.

C. R. ROUNDS, Inspector of English in Normal Schools, Madison, Wis.

ALFRED DWIGHT SHEFFIELD, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.

At the conclusion of the reading of the report of the committee, Mr. Charles R. Gaston moved the adoption of the following resolution:

WHEREAS, A joint committee of the National Education Association, the Modern Language Association of America, and the American Philological Association, assisted by a committee of the National Council of Teachers of English, has worked with untiring diligence through numerous long sessions on the preparation of a report on uniform grammatical terminology, and

WHEREAS, The list of terms adopted is on the whole a good working basis for the selection of what the various grades of the various schools need in the way of grammatical terms, be it hereby

Resolved, That the National Council of Teachers of English cordially indorse in general the report of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature and recommend its use in the schools of the United States.

The motion having been seconded, Principal William Bishop Owen of the Chicago Normal School opened the discussion. He pointed out that the report is not a grammar but merely a list of terms, together with

the reasons for their adoption; that the report is to be regarded as a beginning, to be followed by testing and experimenting; and that the greatest immediate value of it lies in the possibility now before us of being able to discuss grammatical matters with intelligence because we have a set of common terms. He described the painstaking care with which the report was compiled and favored the adoption of the resolution.

C. R. Rounds of Wisconsin followed with an account of the successful use of the new terms in his state, Allan Abbott of Teachers College, Columbia University, spoke enthusiastically in favor of the report, and the resolution was ultimately put to a vote and passed.

The Committee on Home Reading for High-School Pupils presented a printed report in the form of a sixteen-page pamphlet containing an introductory statement and a classified and partially annotated list of books numbering about five hundred titles. The chairman of the committee, Mr. Herbert Bates, of the Manual Training High School in Brooklyn, N.Y., being unable to be present, sent a brief paper, which was read by Professor Calvin L. Lewis of Hamilton College. This is printed below. Each member of the Council who was present received one copy of the list, which is copyrighted and for sale at ten cents a copy, or sixty cents a dozen, postpaid. Members not present may secure the list by sending a post card requesting it.

EXPLANATORY REMARKS UPON THE HOME READING LIST

The formal report of the Committee on Home Reading is already in your hands. The remarks that follow are purely upon my own responsibility. They may consequently fail, in some particulars, to represent the ideas of the committee.

It should be made clear in the first place that the list of books as it stands does not coincide with the personal views of any one member of the committee. Every one of us, if issuing a list of books upon his own individual responsibility, would issue a list different from this. Yet this, while not the list that anyone would choose if left to himself, contains books each of which at least one of our number thoroughly believes in. Each has abandoned his antagonism to another's peculiar likings, in order that his own pet recommendation might be allowed to go through. And this is as it should be. We do not want an average list, a model collection of "perfectly respectable" books that "no one can doubt the advisability of recommending for juvenile perusal." A really good list must not recommend merely the safe middle views of the conservative. It must also embody—of course in moderation—the ideas of the extremists.

It should be like a congress elected upon a basis of proportional representation, containing representatives not only of the great parties that carried the whole country, but also—in numbers proportional to their fraction of the vote—Socialists, Prohibitionists, members of every party whose membership entitles it to attention. Or, to change the illustration, it should be like a great art exhibition, containing not only the classic masters, but illustrations of more recent tendencies—Sorolla, Monet—approaching even to the giddy verge of Cubism and Futurism.

We do not want a list that contains only what nobody dislikes. We want one that will represent—at least by a few examples—*every sort of book that any respectable teacher of English really wishes to see upon it.*

Such a list—and this *is* such a list—must have a wide range. It must be like our so-called temperate zone, including the extremes of pole and equator. It must please—and shock—everybody. If, therefore, even as these words are read, your eye running over the list in your hands, falls upon some title the sight of which congeals your blood, remember that that other book—the one you rejoiced to see a moment ago and hailed as “just what was needed” on such a list—remember that that book probably thrilled some neighbor of yours with equal horror! A stimulating alternation of disgust and delight is far more thrilling than monotonous approbation—and will do one more good.

When I speak of the list as pleasing teachers, I mean, of course, pleasing their judgment as teachers. The books are not intended for our own enjoyment. They are to help us to help the pupil. It is this that accounts chiefly for the wide variety. So wide, in fact, is this variety that at first glance there may seem to be no underlying principle. Yet the principle lies in this very variety—the principle that there should be books to meet every pupil's need. There must be books for every imaginable sort of boy and girl, from twelve to twenty—and from Eastport, Maine, to Seattle!

Much of the lighter fiction, for instance, is intended for the boy or girl who is *alarmed* at the mere idea of reading a book, who is able to count upon the fingers of one hand all the books that he has read outside the classroom. Yet no less important is it to have fiction of a higher type for the bookish reader—the kind of young person who can read and appreciate *Les Misérables* at fourteen.

Some books are named because of their helpfulness in connection with history, or with the prescribed work in English. A few are inserted as models of light, chatty writing. *The Breaking in of a Yachtsman's Wife* and *Daddy Long-Legs* are of this sort. They ought to help pupils to write entertaining letters. Certainly if we can aid in that, we shall be materially increasing the cheerfulness of life.

The number of works by one writer (especially in fiction) has been limited. Exception has been made in the case of standard authors, and in a few cases, books have been chosen to represent the *different types of work* done by one writer. Miss Johnston's *To Have and to Hold* is, for instance, very different

from her *Long Roll*. The same would be true of Winston Churchill's *Richard Carvel* and his *Mr. Crewe's Career* or of H. G. Wells's *Kipps* and his *War of the Worlds*.

In the omission of other works—often of equal value—by the same writer, there is no implication that they are not to be read. The reading may almost always be extended to other works. (There are a few exceptions, but it seemed inadvisable to call attention to them in the list!) We are simply introducing the pupil to a new author—inducing him to begin an acquaintance that may, we hope, develop into intimacy and friendship. Each book named should lead to more. Nor need they be works of the same writer! One book really enjoyed will lead to others of the same type or upon the same subject. Each bit prescribed is not an end in itself but a starting-point for new departures.

No fiction of a sort distinctly juvenile has been admitted (unless distinguished—like *Alice in Wonderland*—by real literary merit). Alger, Henty, Castlemon, Barbour, Trowbridge serve a useful purpose. We do not, however, need to call a high-school boy's attention to them. He will hear enough of them from his schoolmates. There are a few cases where they may with advantage be prescribed personally.

Some may question the including of translations. Of course a book of literary charm may lose in translation, but it does not lose everything. Loti, in a good translation, retains much of his poetic atmosphere. A half a loaf is better than none. I cannot judge—not reading Polish—how much Sienkiewicz loses in Curtin's translation—but the story can lose none of its thrill, and the characterization none of its genius. As for Dumas—he remains himself in any tongue! The poets suffer most, yet it seems better to get some idea of Homer through a good translation than to know him merely as a name. (I should like here, in passing, to say just a word for Palmer's translation of the *Odyssey*. It seems by far the simplest and most human—the easiest for young folks to read.)

In poetry a large use should be made of *collections*. A number of excellent collections are named in the list and the pupil should be encouraged not only to look up particular poems, or at the poems of particular authors, but to browse about for himself and find poems that suit him. Never mind if they are not the poems *you* would choose. The main thing is *that he should care enough about any poem to have an opinion about it*. A boy who regards Wordsworth's poems as "a lot of silly rhymes" may find through Campbell an entrance (by a postern gate, if you like) into the domains of poetry.

A pupil who is not of the sort that we call "literary" does not like his poetry "straight." He must take it diluted with a lot of objective reality, or what he calls "plain sense." Start him with Scott, Campbell, Macaulay, perhaps a little Byron, and add gradually as he responds to treatment. Don't begin by telling him that there is no hope for him unless he likes Shelley's "Skylark," or Rossetti's "Blessed Damozel," or Wordsworth's "Ode to Duty." *Begin where he is*. And at the same time don't confine the really poetic pupil

to Gray's "Elegy," the "Rape of the Lock," Longfellow, and Whittier, with two poems of Milton. They are all good enough, but fail to furnish the food that will satisfy a certain kind of poetic nature. We are trying to make pupils happier—and better—by teaching them how to enjoy the emotional uplift of poetry. We must remember that they are all different in emotional susceptibility. There is hardly anything in which people differ more than in this. *We must show each that poetry has something for him.*

The list of plays has been largely increased. There seems to be a growing interest in drama. Possibly we are entering a new era of dramatic activity. As with poetry, attention must be given to individual tastes. Some are almost unable to read any poetic drama. Probably almost all tastes will be suited by some of the simple Irish plays—those by Lady Gregory, Yeats, and Synge.

There is a decided lack of suitable light essays. Many of those given are, for our purpose, overloaded with allusion. A few of the books that some think frivolous (e.g., *Prime and Robinson*) have been included, like some of the fiction mentioned above, to give a model of a light easy style, a style suitable for letter-writing. Something of this kind is much needed in the second year.

There should be a few good collections of essays, the kind illustrated daily in the editorial and magazine article, the kind of thing ignored by most English teachers, because, as it is not either exposition or argument or narration or description, there cannot be any such animal! A good collection of selected editorials upon easy general topics (not the sort that require notes) would be of the greatest service. The committee has included no such collection in the list—for the same excellent reason that the New York Aquarium has failed to include mermaids and sea-serpents. I hope that this paragraph may appeal to some ambitious editor in need of royalties.

Biography and history are included, not because of eminence in the subject but on account of some merit in the book itself—it may be human interest, it may be charm of style. The thing that puts the book upon the list is what its author puts into it. The same is true of travel and science. The committee has paid no attention to the countries represented. If all who have written well about travel had written about one country and only one, that would be the only country that would appear upon our list. We want the writer whose ideas and whose personality appear through his words, the writer who interests us in what he saw *because he is able to make us feel his interest.*

The collection of speeches is far too short. This is one part of the list that, at the next revision, should be greatly supplemented. There should be more work approximately contemporary. We do not want to teach boys to speak like Webster—if we could! We should show them models of what the world expects of orators today.

Whatever the make-up of the list, there remains one problem—how best to use it. How shall we get the boy and the book together? How shall we get him to read *just* the book that is suited to his particular need? (When I

say "boy" and "he," please understand that each may insert the words "or girl," and "or she.")

To this end of course, the teacher must know two things: he must know the books and he must know the pupil. With the latter problem, he must deal himself. It is often well, in meeting a new class, to defer home reading till some way along in the term, when one has had a chance to learn the tastes, powers, and limitations of each pupil. Really to understand the case of each takes time, and judgment, and sympathy—in fact, all the qualities of a very good teacher.

Knowing the books is a task more directly in the field of this paper. The best way—probably the only satisfactory way—is to read them all. Of course the abbreviated indications of the fiction will help, but they cannot give the kind of information that will enable one to tell a pupil with confidence what the book is and why he should read it. The only way to enable one to speak with conviction about a book is to read it. (I certainly hope we have included none too difficult or too shocking for a teacher to read.) I think myself that, if not done too fast, under pressure, this will give a teacher an excuse for a lot of agreeable light reading! Anyhow, pleasant or not, I have personally not a doubt that it is a thing that ought to be done. The few books on the list that I haven't read through, I am going to read at once, and I am going to *reread* a lot of the rest. In no other way, when I talk about the books to my students, can I really know what I am talking about.

In getting the books into the hands of the students, one must be governed largely by local conditions. In some schools, the books may be put on special shelves in the school library; in others, the pupils may be sent to the public library, where the books have been set aside by the librarian. In other cases the teacher may have a set of books that he will issue himself in his own classroom. The really vital thing, in each case, is to have the book where the pupil can get at it readily. He should, if possible, be able to take the book in his own hands and "nibble" to see if he likes it. Like preachers, we are fishers of men, and we must give the fish a chance to get a good taste of the bait!

If he refuses, by the way, to like the book that you recommend, and finds that he prefers another, which will benefit him equally, no harm will be done! Nature has merely improved upon your prescription.

In many cases it is not necessary to recommend the reading of the whole book. Some parts will be better than others. Even in fiction there are novels where there is but one passage particularly worth recommending—and that a masterpiece. In *John Brent*, for example, there is the glorious "Ride for the Lady," followed by quite a commonplace love-story. In Hearn's *Chita* there is the masterly description of the storm: it is not necessary for the reader to follow the course of the plot into the sickroom. Help the pupil to pick the best from each book. Never mind the rest.

As is said in the printed report, one should not post the list without comment, nor should one as a rule recommend many titles at one time. The

really vital thing is, if possible, to find a chance to talk over his reading personally with each pupil.

Opinions differ regarding the advisability of having the student make a written report upon his reading. Most seem to feel, however, that the pupil's report should be either oral or a short written comment, giving, in a sentence or so, his opinion of the book. He need merely tell whether he likes it or not, and why. For example, he may report upon *Judith Shakespeare*, "I don't like it. Slow, nothing doing, too much about girls"; or "Very fine book, it gives me a good idea of how they lived then." One should, however, *allow* the pupil to make the report long, if he wants. In the fourth year more can be expected than in lower grades.

This is called, I believe, a "final report" of the committee. Please do not judge from this—whatever may be the relations of the report and the committee—that this list is in any sense final. There can be no such thing as a *final* list of books for home reading. The task of revising a home-reading list, like a polygon in pursuit of its limit, goes on forever. The work isn't the sort that one can finish. Like cutting lawns, or cooking meals, or washing one's hands, it takes eternal doing. When the National Council of Teachers of English meets at Chicago in 2013 or in 3213, the list then presented for discussion, however much better than this, will not be "final." An ideal list made out by Bacon in the time of Shakespeare would contain very few books that we should care to retain now, and would lack most of the books that appear on the list before you. Times will go on changing, and a list like this must change with them. Only by changing itself can it remain what it is, can it present a constantly identical reaction to the altering flow of circumstance.

In future revisions, I would suggest a radical change of method—one central committee *working in one place* consulting frequently and talking out all questions that arise, but supplemented by a number of consulting members (widely distributed) who will suggest changes, criticize changes proposed, and, above all, see that the point of view of their own part of the country is brought clearly to the committee's notice.

One very important piece of work remains to be done in a list of this sort—the classification and description of the individual books. This task should be carried out by a committee containing at least one trained and experienced librarian. (The present indications are inadequate and are inserted merely as better than nothing.)

I have learned a great deal from doing this work. I have heard of—and have read—a number of good books hitherto unknown to me. I have discovered, in advising others, how far I was falling short of doing what I was advising others to do. I only hope that this list can do others, and the pupils under them, half as much good as it has done me and the pupils under my charge. I hope that each teacher will realize how little our prescribed reading alone can do in opening to pupils the treasure-house of letters. Teaching pupils to like books is hard work, but it brings its reward. It is our pupils

who finally "mark" our work, who write "passed" or "failed" upon our efforts. The real certificate of success is not the principal's approval, or the superintendent's or the school board's; it is the gratitude of the pupil, the pupil who, years afterward, will meet you and say, "It was you who taught me to care for books," "It was you who taught me how to find inspiration in literature," or "It was you who showed me how books might make me better and happier."

This is the work we all want to do. I hope that this list may aid in it.

HERBERT BATES, *Chairman*

It was moved and seconded that the report of the Committee on Home Reading be accepted and the committee discharged. This was amended to provide for the carrying-out of the recommendation of the committee to the effect that a standing committee be constituted which shall issue supplemental reports and revise the main list from time to time as well as supply suitable annotations. The motion as amended was then carried.

A brief report of the progress of the Committee on English in the Country Schools was read, in the absence of the chairman, by Professor John H. Cox of the University of West Virginia. This report was as follows:

Your committee appointed for the investigation of the status of the teaching of English in the country schools of the United States reports as follows:

This past summer we addressed a *questionnaire* to the state departments of schools in all the different states. These we sent out at once, with the request that they be filled out and returned to the chairman of the committee as soon as possible. As only a few reports were received, we mailed another copy of the *questionnaire* to each of those states not reporting. This second request brought in but a few more reports. Up to the present, we have information respecting the following states: Virginia, West Virginia, Tennessee, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Ohio, Michigan, Kansas, Idaho, Nebraska, Utah, New Jersey, Connecticut—thirteen in all.

Your committee feels that since this investigation must be based on information from all, or nearly all, of the states, and that since our information is to be obtained largely through this *questionnaire*, we must wait until we receive more information before making our final report. We earnestly urge all members of the Council, who have influence with the departments of schools in their respective states, to bring this matter to the attention of state superintendents and rural supervisors, to the end that this committee may be enabled to complete its investigation of this subject.

WALTER BARNES, *Chairman*

The chairman of the Committee on School and College Plays, Mr. Thacher H. Guild, stated that the committee had mapped out a

plan of work. It will co-operate with the Committee on the High-School Course, it will seek to make the value of dramatic work known, and it will publish from time to time lists of plays, suggestions on dramatics, and such information as it can collect concerning the use of plays in various institutions.

Professor V. C. Coulter announced for the Committee on English Equipment that the list of material reported last year is now being largely increased, and that teachers are requested to make statements regarding additional material that would be desirable in order that it may be placed upon the market if not now obtainable. The final report of this committee will, it is expected, be made a bulletin of the Bureau of Education; and the chairman invites questions and suggestions by letter.

Professor E. M. Hopkins stated for the Committee on English Composition Teaching that of its two reports fifteen editions numbering in all more than 25,000 copies have been published and distributed; and that the Bureau of Education has authorized the continuance and extension of the committee's work, with a view to final publication as a bulletin or series of bulletins. New matter, not in the present report, is to include the following:

Revised and completed tabulations.

Plates and diagrams.

Extended list of apparatus for English work, prepared by Professor Coulter's committee.

Further data on cost of teaching college subjects.

Report on the Illinois experimental comparison of oral and written English composition, prepared by Professor John M. Clapp.

Report on the nature and results of oral training based on a special inquiry in Kansas and Missouri.

Report of the general causes of inefficiency in secondary school English teaching, prepared by Principal Edwin L. Miller.

Possible further data on the relative variations of efficiency and the number of pupils assigned to a teacher.

This committee also offered resolutions, requested by Council delegates, as set forth below.

Professor Hopkins also reported for the Committee on Elementary School English, which includes the Committee on English Composition Teaching with several additional members representing elementary schools, that it has been engaged for a year in preparing its questionnaire, that the Bureau of Education has authorized its proposed investigation

and has offered it all possible assistance, and that the committee is now actively engaged in organizing co-operating committees and subcommittees to handle the questions according to the plan outlined in the October *Journal*. Actual distribution of the questionnaires should begin not later than February. It is hoped that members of the Council will respond promptly to these questions.

The resolutions above referred to as offered by the Committee on English Composition at the request of delegates are based upon the following facts:

That the investigations of this committee, confirmed in every possible way since first publication of its report, show that highly satisfactory work in English composition teaching cannot be done under average conditions in secondary schools in which the assignment of pupils in composition exceeds eighty to a teacher, or in colleges in which such assignment exceeds sixty to a teacher, as a maximum in each case; and that for the highest efficiency these numbers should be decreased.

That at present the average number of pupils so assigned exceeds 125 in secondary schools and 100 in colleges.

That the first and essential step to be taken toward increasing the efficiency of composition teaching, a step without which, no matter how favorable other conditions, high efficiency is a physical impossibility, is to decrease that number.

That the cost of taking the step will not be prohibitive since at present English, although admittedly the most important subject in the secondary school curriculum, costs less than any other; and since in an individual school it has been established by actual trial that to reduce the number of pupils assigned to a single English teacher to an ideal point much below the maximum of eighty does not increase the expense of English above 25 per cent, while it more than doubles efficiency, and produces results of conspicuous excellence, even from pupils of foreign parentage.

That since progress in the desired direction must be slow and gradual, such beginning as is possible should be made without delay.

That the North Central Association has under consideration the adoption of a rule that no school in its territory shall be accredited in English if the maximum number of pupils assigned to a single teacher in English exceeds five classes of twenty-five pupils each.

That teachers' associations in two states (New York and Wisconsin) have requested that the maximum be made not to exceed one hundred.

In view of these facts, the subjoined resolutions were offered:

I

The National Council of Teachers of English approves the steps taken by the North Central Association to limit and decrease the number of pupils assigned to English teachers in high schools, and requests the Association and all similar accrediting bodies to recommend for immediate action that schools in which the maximum number of pupils assigned to a single English teacher exceeds one hundred be not accredited in English; and it also requests the Association and all similar accrediting bodies to take further action at as early a date as seems expedient to reduce this maximum to eighty, with due provision, as at present recommended, for necessary time for conference and theme reading counted as teaching time.

II

It is the sense of the National Council of Teachers of English that in order to secure satisfactory results in college English it is essential that the maximum number of students in Freshman English Composition assigned to a single instructor should in no case exceed sixty; and that when such an instructor has classes in other subjects, a corresponding reduction should be made in the number of pupils assigned him in English composition.

The resolutions were adopted unanimously.

The chairman of the Committee on the Preparation of High-School Teachers of English, Professor Franklin T. Baker, was represented by Mr. Allan Abbott, who stated that the committee was not yet fully organized, but that it would as soon as possible undertake to learn what sort of preparation the high-school work demands and to make this known to all those concerned with the employing or preparing of high-school teachers.

The chairman of the Committee on the Preparation of College Teachers of English, Professor James F. Hosis, of the Chicago Normal College, explained that this committee is primarily a committee of the Central Division of the Modern Language Association of America. An investigation was carried on in the fall of 1912 to ascertain the opinion of the heads of English departments in the large universities, of Doctors of Philosophy who are teaching college English, and of the presidents of the smaller colleges with regard to the value of graduate work as preparation for teaching and also as to the best means of such preparation. The replies received were of such character as to justify the appointment of a representative committee to complete the inquiry and make recommendations. The committee will undertake to learn what preparation the college work demands and what preparation the

universities actually offer. The various requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy will be tabulated and the relations between departments of education and departments of English inquired into. When the facts are well in hand, recommendations will be made.

The Committee on the Reorganization of the High-School Course in English reported to the College and High-School Section, and an account of that report will be found under the notes of the meeting of that section.

NEW COMMITTEES

On motion of Mr. Searson the Council instructed the Executive Committee to appoint a committee on the English work of the first six elementary grades. It is understood that this committee will cover the ground not provided for by the committees already at work upon the course of study. At the meeting of delegates a motion was passed calling upon the Executive Committee to establish a Committee on Publicity. The duty of this committee will be to make the proceedings of the Council and of its committees known to the teachers and school authorities of the several states.

THE STATUS OF LIBRARIANS

It was moved by Mr. W. H. Kerr of Emporia, Kansas, that the National Council of Teachers of English recommend to school authorities everywhere that librarians in high schools, colleges, and normal schools be placed upon the same professional footing as regular teachers, provided that they have professional training as librarians and that their scholarship is equivalent to that of regular teachers. The motion was seconded and carried.

SPECIAL MEETINGS

It was announced that the Board of Directors had authorized the Executive Committee to arrange special meetings of the National Council in connection with the Department of Superintendence at Richmond, Virginia, February 27 and 28, 1914, in connection with the summer meeting of the National Education Association at St. Paul in July, 1914, and in connection with the Congress of Education at the Panama-Pacific Exposition in Oakland, California, in 1915.

THE PROGRAM

GENERAL SESSION, FRIDAY FORENOON, NOVEMBER 28

With the exception of Professor Edwin Mims, who was obliged to telegraph his regrets at the last minute, every person who had promised

to prepare a paper or a discussion was on hand. The opening session was remarkable for the originality and force of the papers read. Professor Scott chose for the title of the president's address "The Unde-fended Gate." This proved to be the free access of the newspaper. The address will be found in the opening pages of this number of the *Journal*. Percival Chubb's trumpet call to the revival of oral literature will be found there also. Professor Jastrow presented the results of an investigation of the sensibility of representatives of various classes to slang and other forms of bad English and bad manners.

SECTION MEETINGS, FRIDAY AFTERNOON, NOVEMBER 28

COLLEGE AND HIGH-SCHOOL SECTION

Chairman, Charles W. Kent, University of Virginia; *Secretary*, Jessie E. Sherman, Chicago Normal College.

The first paper was presented by Joseph V. Denney, of Ohio State University, whose topic was, "The Factors Which Should Determine the College Course in English." These he conceived to be specific discipline through the material of composition and of literature, vocational elements, preparation for teaching, the foundation provided by the high schools, and extra-vocational or cultural elements. In discussion, Frank Aydelotte, of Indiana University, urged that both literature and composition be regarded as offering a means of training pupils to think. C. C. Certain, of Birmingham, Alabama, emphasized the relation of the college course to the high-school course. He had collected opinions as to the aims of English work and found that college and high school agreed. College men complain that high-school graduates lack the power of expression, have little accurate knowledge, no taste for literature, and no ability to read aloud. These charges are mainly true. Nevertheless, college men must remember the tremendous obstacles which the teacher in the crowded schools of the day must overcome. High-school teachers, on their part, should seek to prepare their pupils for real life.

Then followed a preliminary report by the chairman of the Committee on the Reorganization of Secondary English, James F. Hosis, of the Chicago Normal College. This is printed and may be obtained of the Secretary of the National Council. It also comprises a part of *Bulletin No. 41*, Bureau of Education, series of 1913. Stress was laid upon the fact that not college entrance but life-development of the pupils was the prime consideration in the work of this committee as contrasted with other national committees. In discussion, Allan Abbott, of Teachers College, Columbia University, said:

The report of the Joint Committee on the High-School Course in English embodies certain principles that seem to me fundamental, if the study is to become socially effective.

First of all, and most important, the proposed outline is inclusive and suggestive, not restrictive and mandatory. Nothing could be more disastrous to the cause of good English teaching than for this Council to indorse a course of study so definite in its prescriptions that superintendents could adopt it literally, without adapting it to local needs.

With regard to the value of many of the suggestions of the report, we shall doubtless differ—and we ought to differ. Each school, according to its location, its social background, the aims of its student body, will stress one feature or another, each teacher, according to his experience, training, and temperament, will to a certain degree stress what he can teach most effectively. The committee simply says here are many things, all of them worth doing; take from them whatever your school needs.

The report is somewhat radical, and I think properly so, in what it omits, as well as what it includes. Nothing is said of formal grammar, as such, or formal rhetoric, even of the familiar forms of discourse, narration, description, exposition, argumentation. Nothing is said of American literature as a separate thing from English literature; very little of literary history or the lives of authors. This change of emphasis is, I believe, important. Grammar and rhetoric are purely auxiliary—useful only as they help the pupil to express more effectively something he wants to say. Literary history and literary biography are useful only as they may strengthen the understanding and appreciation of the actual literature.

On the side of subjects to be taught, then, the report minimizes formal categories, as grammar, rhetoric, literary periods, in order that it may stress the material of these categories—the ideas to be gained through reading, to be expressed through writing and speech.

As for method of teaching, the report calls for a distinct recognition, on the part of both teacher and pupil, of the specific purpose of each kind of work and indicates a sharp differentiation of method according to the purpose in hand. This point is illustrated by the suggestions under IV*d*, as to three kinds of reading. A school working under this scheme would not tolerate the practice, so common in schools, of dawdling away six or eight weeks on an easy novel, when the pupils are reading one or two a week at home.

Finally, the report attempts to phrase each kind of English work, not as an academic exercise, but as a thing of clearly seen present or eventual value in the pupil's life. The kinds of writing and speaking to be taught are those that the pupil already has occasion to use. The work in literature takes account of the kind of reading that pupils actually do for themselves—the rapid reading of fiction—and tries to build upon that such habits of reflective reading and of discriminating choice of books as will make literature now, as well as later, an essential part of their lives. The worth of every bit of our

work is to be tested by the degree to which it works out into something valuable in the life of the pupil; the degree to which it enables him to live more usefully, more happily, more worthily. This is the unifying basis of the many apparently scattering recommendations of the committee, and its chief claim to consideration—the recognition of the prime importance is the teaching of English—of its actual social values.

John C. Hanna, principal of the Oak Park High School, Oak Park, Illinois, sought to emphasize a single point, namely, that one-third of life is spent in leisure, and that the work in English must mainly bear the burden of preparing the pupils for the wise use of leisure. This being so, care must be exercised lest the pendulum swing too far away from culture and toward mere vocation. George B. Aiton, inspector of high schools, Minneapolis, Minnesota, pointed out that our problem is now that of educating the children of the masses. Hence we must adapt our work to those who require simple treatment; we must begin by improving the work in the grades, beyond which most pupils never go. Mr. Abbott added that he had observed that there is lack in Chicago, for example, of adaptation of the course to the classes. Commercial pupils should get literature, but probably not the same literature as those in academic courses.

The last paper in this section was read by O. J. Stevenson, of the Faculty of Education, University of Toronto. His topic was "The Old and the New in Literature Teaching." He stressed the value of oral presentation and the asking of questions which will direct the attention of the pupils to the author's main purpose and ideas. The speaker presented a number of interesting illustrations of his points.

NORMAL AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SECTION

Chairman, Samuel A. Lynch, Iowa State Teachers' College; *Secretary*, Nellie Lally, School of Education, University of Chicago.

The meeting opened with a paper on "What the Elementary and Normal Schools Should Do in Regard to Simplified Spelling," by Willis H. Wilcox, of the Maryland Normal School. He reviewed the history of spelling and indicated the immense advantage to accrue from the use of simpler spelling, but did not fail to take note of the difficulties in the way. Mr. Wiseley, of the Indiana Normal School, pointed out that much advance is possible if we will but choose always the simplest spelling that is authorized. There were several reports showing live interest in the subject and some progress in the use of simpler spellings.

Mrs. Ada Van Stone Harris presented a paper on the topic, "How

Can the Teaching of English Composition Be Made an Incentive to the Acquisition of Ideas?" The speaker urged the necessity of keeping the composition activities close to the actual life of the pupils and also the value of the oral as opposed to the written forms of expression. Mr. Wilcox remarked that a habit of taking care in the matter of form should be established. Mrs. Harris rejoined that a correct final draft should follow blackboard work and thorough development of the subject. Mr. Leonard, of the Milwaukee Normal School, deplored the mistaken emphasis which form sometimes receives. He would teach a few important elements and would show the real value of these.

The final paper embodied "Suggestions for the Improvement of the Teaching of Composition in Elementary Schools." This was offered by Edwin M. Hopkins, of the University of Kansas. The speaker made a plea for a serious and thoroughgoing investigation to ascertain the causes which prevent the highest success in the teaching of English to children and outlined the plan which the committee of which he is chairman has arranged for this purpose.

LIBRARY SECTION

Chairman, Willis H. Kerr, Kansas State Normal School.

The librarians of the schools and colleges met with the other members of the Council for the first time. The attendance was good and the program stimulating. J. W. Searson, of the Kansas Agricultural College, read a very practical paper on the effect of live English teaching upon the use of the library. Miss Irene Warren, of the School of Education, University of Chicago, followed with a plea for the training of teachers in the knowledge and use of books and libraries. The remainder of the program consisted of a symposium upon "The Essentials in the Correlation of Library and Student." Miss Martha Wilson, of St. Paul, spoke for the elementary schools, Miss Florence Hopkins, of Detroit, for the high schools, L. L. Dickerson, of Grinnell College, for the colleges, and Theodore Koch, of the University of Michigan, for the universities.

The section voted to ask Mr. Searson to act as chairman for the ensuing year.

The following resolutions were adopted:

In view of the rapid growth of the library and its function in modern education, the Library Section of the National Council of Teachers of English, in session at Chicago, November 28, 1913, presents for the consideration and approval of educational and civic and state authorities the following:

First, Good service from libraries is indispensable to the best educational work.

Second, The wise direction of a library requires scholarship, executive ability, tact, and other high-grade qualifications, together with special training for the effective direction of cultural reading, choice of books, and teaching of reference principles.

Third, Because much latent power is being recognized in the library and is awaiting development, it is believed that so valuable a factor in education should be accorded a dignity worthy of the requisite qualifications; and that, in schools and educational systems, the director of the library should be recognized as a department head, who shall be able to undertake progressive work, be granted necessary assistants, and be compensated in status and salary equally with the supervisors of other departments.

PUBLIC SPEAKING SECTION

Chairman, Thomas C. Trueblood, University of Michigan.

The meeting was called to order by the chairman, who spoke briefly on the remarkable growth and development of the public-speaking work in the schools during recent years.

The program following was carried out exactly as it had been previously announced.

Emma J. Breck, of the Oakland High School, Oakland, California, in her paper on "Oral English in the High School in Relation to the English Course," gave a very clear statement of the comprehensive plan of work that has been developed for the oral English work in the high schools of Oakland, California, and suggested certain further needs of the high schools in this direction. Clarion D. Hardy, of Northwestern University, in discussing Miss Breck's paper emphasized and supported her position.

Edward J. Eaton, Central High School, Grand Rapids, Michigan, in a paper entitled, "Should Oral English in High School Be Given Separate Credit?" argued that this would mean separate courses in oral English, and he pointed to the experience of the Grand Rapids schools in giving separate credit as an evidence of its desirability. Elmer W. Smith, of Colgate University, Hamilton, New York, in discussing this paper inclined to the opinion that oral and written English in most schools should be combined in the same courses and given credit together rather than separately.

Rollo L. Lyman, of the University of Chicago, in "Some Suggested Reforms in Intercollegiate Debating," advocated, among other things, the abolition of all coaching of teams, statement of the issues involved in the question, the submission of briefs to the judges before the debate, and a limitation of the time for preparation. Charles H. Woolbert, of

the University of Illinois, in discussion took issue with the paper on nearly all points on the ground that the proposed changes would lower the standard of the debates.

Robert I. Fulton, of Ohio Wesleyan University, in a paper on "College Courses in Public Speaking," outlined what he considered an ideal course in public speaking for the four years' college course. Harold B. Gislason, of the University of Minnesota, made some additional suggestions on the work of such a course.

Following the set program there was a brief general discussion. It was moved by Mr. Smith of Colgate University that the conference request the president of the National Council of Teachers of English to appoint a committee representing the three affiliated councils of public speaking to prepare a recommendation of rules governing intercollegiate debating. The motion was amended to provide that the appointment should be made by the chairman of this conference. Carried as amended. The following were appointed: D. W. Redmond, College of the City of New York, *chairman*; S. J. Taffe, Fordham University; H. G. McKean, Union University; Robert I. Fulton, Ohio Wesleyan University; D. G. Lean, Wooster (Ohio) University; Harry Gough, DePauw University; C. H. Woolbert, University of Illinois; J. M. O'Neill, University of Wisconsin; H. B. Gislason, University of Minnesota.

Charles H. Woolbert, was elected as chairman for the coming year.

About one hundred and twenty-five attended the annual dinner. The speakers were Dr. Charles W. Kent, of the University of Virginia, Mrs. Henry Hulst, of Grand Rapids, Michigan, and Mr. J. Milton O'Neill, of the University of Wisconsin.

After the dinner a conference of delegates was held in the South Parlor. Edwin Fairley, of the New York City Association, suggested a united effort to secure smaller and fewer classes and the co-operation of all departments. Harry G. Paul, of the Illinois Association, spoke of the successful features of his society, particularly of its monthly bulletins and of its investigations of special problems, such as that of the relation of oral to written composition.

There followed a general and sometimes animated discussion, which led ultimately to a motion intended to bring about the appointment of a committee of publicity, with representatives in all parts of the country.